1	placed in the file earlier?
2	A Correct.
3	Q And that would have been for years 1993 and
4	1995?
5	A Yeah. I don't remember the precise years.
6	(The document referred to was
7	marked for identification as
8	Ramirez Exhibit No. 11.)
9	BY MR. SHOOK:
10	Q I've got them somewhere. I think this part
11	of the process has been more confused than most, if
12	you can believe it. What I'm showing to Mr. Ramirez
13	is from the September 7, 2004, filing that SFUSD had
14	made in response to our request for admissions of
15	fact. Specifically, what I'm showing him initially is
16	Attachment 2 to that.
17	If you'll note on the first page, it makes
18	reference to January 31, 1993, in terms of what this
19	report is supposed to be referring to. Then when you
20	turn to the second page, you'll notice that the
21	signature block appears to reflect that the document
22	was signed on 10 December 1997. Is this one of the
23	documents that you recall preparing in draft for
24	signature on or about December 10, 1997?
25	A Yes.

1	Q What was the cause of preparing this
2	document?
3	A The cause was having knowledge that these
4	are supplemental reports, that these supplemental
5	reports should have been filed or placed in the public
6	file with respect to this one in 1993.
7	Q In terms of who signed of on this report,
8	the signature line reflects Waldemar Rojas, but
9	there's also some initials there that appear to
10	follow, which would suggest to me, at least, that
11	somebody other than Mr. Rojas actually signed this
12	document. Do you have any idea of who it is that
13	actually signed this document?
14	A Yeah. To the best of my memory, he had
15	another special assistant. Her name, if I'm recalling
16	this correctly, is Linda Davis. Quite often, when I
17	would work with the superintendent's office or Enrique
18	Palacios would work with the superintendent's office,
19	we were working through Linda Davis.
20	Q First of all, it appears to be the initials
21	LD, and that would suggest that it was Ms. Davis that
22	actually signed this report?
23	A Correct.
24	//
25	//

1	(The document referred to was
2	marked for identification as
3	Ramirez Exhibit No. 12.)
4	BY MR. SHOOK:
5	Q From the same pleading, there's an
6	Attachment 4, and I'd like you to take a look at the
7	Attachment 4. What is Attachment 4?
8	A Attachment 4 looks to be the 1995
9	supplemental ownership report.
10	Q Which was also prepared in December 1997?
11	A Correct.
12	Q And apparently also signed on December 10,
13	1997, by Linda Davis, who affixed Mr. Rojas' name?
14	A Correct.
15	MS. REPP: Excuse me. May we take the break
16	we talked about, off the record for 10, 15 minutes?
17	MR. SHOOK: And then you want to have your
18	opportunity to ask questions? We'll wait and then
19	MS. REPP: No. Well, can we talk a little
20	bit among ourselves.
21	MR. SHOOK: Sure.
22	(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)
23	MR. SHOOK: Okay. Why don't we resume
24	again.
25	//

1	BY MR. SHOOK:
2	Q So with respect to page 3, which is what we
3	were looking at, in terms of the question, "On
4	August 1, 1997, when the subject license renewal
5	application was filed, did the KALW-FM public
6	inspection files contain all of the ownership and
7	supplemental reports required to be kept by then
8	Section 7335.27," it's your understanding that the
9	answer to that question should have been no, not yes?
10	A Correct, because later on in December we
11	created the 1993 and 1995 supplemental ownership
12	reports.
13	Q But it's also the case that with respect to
14	this April 2001 letter, no one from SFUSD contacted
15	you about how to respond to this question?
16	A Correct.
17	Q I'd like to move on to page 5 of that
18	letter. Question No. 2 reads, "On August 1, 1997, did
19	the KALW-FM public inspection file contain all of the
20	issues program lists required by then Section
21	7335.27?" If you could, please, just read the
22	response to yourself, and then I'll ask you a question
23	or two about it. The response begins on page 5 and
24	carries over to page 6.
25	Now, in terms of the response to the
	Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1	question, the question asks about whether the issues
2	program lists required were in the public file on
3	August 1, 1997, wouldn't the correct response be no,
4	not yes?
5	A Yes. Correct.
6	Q So in other words, there were lists that
7	should have been there but weren't there in the public
8	file?
9	A Correct.
10	(The document referred to was
11	marked for identification as
12	Ramirez Exhibit No. 13.)
13	BY MR. SHOOK:
14	Q Now, one of the things that concerns us, and
15	you may or may not be able to help us here, is the
16	reference to the NPR lists. If you look down at the
17	bottom of page 5 and at the top of page 6, it talks
18	about when the management reviewed the file, they were
19	able to find nationally-produced NPR issues programs
20	lists. I want to show you what we believe to be the
21	kind of lists that were being referred to. It was
22	printed from a compact disc that we received from the
23	school district during discovery. They had placed on
24	that disc many documents that were in the public file.
25	One such document is entitled, "KALW carried
	Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

- the following NPR programming in the summer quarter of
- 2 1992." It begins at KALW-000128 and runs to 000145.
- 3 I want you to just take a brief look at it. You don't
- 4 have to look at it closely, but just take a brief look
- 5 at it. Now, have you seen a document like this
- 6 before?
- 7 A No.
- 8 Q Another thing is that with respect to what
- 9 appears at the top, if you look at the upper right
- 10 hand corner of each page, there's a date and a time.
- 11 You'll see that that date is 3/14/01. Do you have any
- 12 knowledge as to whether or not this would suggest that
- 13 that was the date that this document was prepared?
- 14 A No, I don't. No.
- 15 Q You wouldn't know one way or the other?
- 16 A Correct.
- Q Going back to page 5 of the April 2001
- 18 response -- assuming that "yes" constitutes a sentence
- 19 -- the third sentence of that response reads, "Mr.
- 20 Ramirez, who reviewed the contents of the file in July
- and August 1997 in connection with the preparation of
- 22 KALW's license for renewal form, certified on July 30,
- 23 1997, in accordance with the relevant question on
- 24 License Renewal Form 303, that KALW had placed in its
- 25 public inspection file at the appropriate times the

- documentation required by 47 C.F.R. Section 7335.26
- 2 and 7335.27."
- 3 My question based on that is did you tell
- 4 anyone connected with SFUSD on or about April 5, 2001,
- 5 that you had reviewed the contents of the public file
- 6 in July and August 1997?
- 7 A No.
- 8 O Now, you had reviewed the contents of the
- 9 file sometime in 1997 --
- 10 A Correct.
- 11 Q -- as you testified. That probably would
- have been in July 1997 in connection with the
- preparation of the renewal application?
- 14 A Correct, or sooner.
- 15 Q You hadn't looked at in August 1997, had
- 16 you, after the application was filed?
- 17 A I see. I don't remember if I looked at it
- after the file -- after the renewal application was
- 19 filed. These dates confuse me.
- 20 Q Right. Well, it confused us a little bit,
- 21 too. The renewal application was prepared at the end
- of July 1997, and it was filed on August 1. So from
- our earlier conversation, I came to the understanding
- 24 that you had certainly looked at the public file prior
- 25 to the filing of the renewal application, but

- considering all the other things that you were
 responsible for that it appeared to us that you hadn't
- 3 looked at the public file again until after the
- 4 petition to deny had come to your attention.
- 5 A Correct.
- 6 Q Now, other than the conversation with Mr.
- 7 Sanchez, you had indicated that you had a very brief
- 8 conversation with him in July 2001, basically to the
- 9 effect that the hearing designation Order had come out
- and that the FCC was all exorcised about this renewal
- 11 application --
- MS. REPP: Excuse me. I think you meant
- 13 2004.
- 14 MR. SHOOK: Excuse me, 2004. I'm fixated on
- 15 2001. All right. Let me try that again.
- 16 BY MR. SHOOK:
- 17 O Other than the conversation that you
- mentioned that you had with Mr. Sanchez that you had
- in July 2004, when the hearing designation Order came
- 20 out, prior to today, have you spoken with anybody
- 21 about the renewal application?
- 22 A No. I keep saying no, but I have met with
- 23 Marissa to talk about this, so I don't know if that --
- 24 when I was answering no, I was thinking in terms of
- 25 the hearing process. So yes, I have talked to Marissa

1	about it,	but that's in the context of the deposition,
2	so I just	wanted to make sure that
3	Q	So your conversations with Marissa would
4	have been	of very recent time?
5	Α	Correct.
6	Q	Within the last month?
7	A	Correct.
8	Q	Maybe within the last two weeks?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	But not before then?
11	A	Well, between July and now, we've had a
12	couple of	conversations, yes.
13	Q	Which began approximately when?
14	A	August and September of this year.
15		(The document referred to was
16		marked for identification as
17		Ramirez Exhibit No. 14.)
18		BY MR. SHOOK:
19	Q	I'm showing you a document called,
20	Enforcemen	nt Bureau's Request for Admission of Facts
21	and Genui:	neness of Documents. Someday I'll learn to
22	spell "ge:	nuineness." Is this a document that you've
23	seen befor	re? Just glance through it.
24	A	Yes. I think so, yes.
!5	Q	And the date of our document is August 19?
		Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1	A Yes.
2	Q So you recall seeing a document like this
3	sometime around the end of August of this year?
4	A Yes, it would have been in August. It would
5	have been before this date.
6	Q Well, that would have been pretty good,
7	because I hadn't figured out what to ask yet, so it
8	couldn't have been then. You must be thinking of the
9	next document I'm going to show you, dated
10	September 7. It's the school district's responses to
11	our admissions, so perhaps that's what you're thinking
12	of.
13	A Okay. These are the questions?
14	Q Right.
15	A That's what I okay.
16	Q I know you're a bright fellow, but
17	A Okay. Yes, I've seen this.
18	Q You've seen the responses?
19	A Yeah.
20	Q Did you have any role in generating any of
21	the responses? We can just go over them one by one.
22	Why don't you look at them for each one and then tell
23	us what your role was, if any.
24	A It's pretty long.
25	Q Right. Well, it won't take as long as you
	Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1	might think.
2	A Well, I know for sure that the sections I
3	looked at were the sections where I'm mentioned.
4	Marissa had asked me to take a look at the draft to
5	confirm that the sections where I'm mentioned were
6	correct to the best of my knowledge or that I agreed.
7	Q Which ones are they? Let's try to get
8	specific.
9	A Well, generally, I think it's any section
10	that has my name in it.
11	Q For anything like that, why don't you read
12	the question involved and then read the answer, and
13	we'll talk about whether or not that's complete.
14	A Do you want to go?
15	Q One by one. I mean, if you have no
16	involvement with the question, you could just say
17	Question such and thus is one that I had no role in,
18	and we can just skip it.
19	A So No. 2, the question is
20	Q So No. 1 you had no role in?
21	A Correct.
22	Q What was No. 2?
23	A No. 2, it asked, "Mr. Ramirez oversaw
24	preparation of the original of Attachment A."
25	Q And Attachment A refers to the renewal

```
application. That would be?
                 Yes.
 2
           Α
                 So you can see Attachment A refers to the
 3
      renewal application that was signed on July 30, 1997.
 4
                 Yes. No. 3, "At the time that he oversaw
 5
      preparation of the original of Attachment A, Mr.
 6
      Ramirez was general manager of KALW." No. 4 --
 7
                 And the answer is correct?
           Q
 8
           Α
                 Yes.
 9
                 And Request 4?
            Q
10
                 The answer is correct.
11
                 Request 5?
12
           Q
                 That's correct.
13
           Α
                 Request 6?
14
                 That's correct.
15
                 Request 7?
16
                 That is correct.
            Α
17
                 Request 8?
            Q
18
                 I didn't have any role in that.
19
                 Okay. Request 9?
20
                 That's correct.
21
                 Request 10?
            Q
22
                 That's correct.
23
                 Request 11?
24
           Q
                 That's correct.
25
           Α
```

Request 12? For that, you're going to have to see what Attachment C is. 2 I don't think I had a role in this question. 3 Α Okay. Then Request 13? Q 4 Α The answer is correct. Now, let me take a look at this. Request 6 14? 7 8 Α That's correct. Q Request 15? 9 I don't believe I had a role in that A 10 question. 11 Request 16? Q 12 That's correct. 13 Request 17? 0 14 That is correct. Α 15 Request 18? Now, I recognize that there's a 16 fair amount of legal amount of legal argument there, 17 which you could say whether or not you had any role in 18 that. I would expect you did not. 19 Yeah, I didn't. I'm not quite sure how to 20 respond to this question. Up until a certain point, 21 the answer is correct, and then it gets into, I guess, 22 the legal argument. 23 Why don't you read into the record that 24 portion that you believe to be correct? 25

1	A I just want to make clear that when I say
2	correct, it's that I had a role in reviewing it.
3	Q If you did not have a role and you really
4	don't know whether or not the particular answer is
5	correct, there's certainly no problem with saying so.
6	If there is an answer there that you had a direct role
7	in formulating and you believe it to be correct, then
8	it's perfectly acceptable to say so. If there's any
9	part of the answer that you provided us that you
10	believe needs to be modified or corrected in some way
11	this is the time to do it.
12	A Yeah, this whole answer, given that the
13	first sentence starts with a qualifier that there's a
14	legal conclusion to be drawn here, I'm not quite sure
15	how to react to the whole
16	Q If you're not certain, you can say so, and
17	then we'll just go on to the next one.
18	A Yeah. I don't think I'm qualified to
19	respond to this whole section.
50	Q That's fine. So we're up to No. 19?
21	A Yeah. Again, I haven't read the whole
22	section, but again the first sentence starts out with
23	a qualification that this calls for a legal
24	conclusion. I don't feel qualified to
:5	Q That's fine. Request 20?

1	A I didn't have anything to do with that.
2	Q Request 21?
3	A I didn't have anything to do with that.
4	Q Request 22?
5	A I didn't have anything to do with that.
6	Q Request 23?
7	A I don't think I'm qualified to respond to
8	that. It starts off again with a legal conclusion
9	question.
10	Q Request 24?
11	A I wasn't involved in that.
12	Q Request 25?
13	A I was not involved in that.
14	Q I want to show you another document that
15	came from the compact disc.
16	MS. REPP: I'm sorry. May I borrow your
17	copy to see what that was?
18	(The document referred to was
19	marked for identification as
20	Ramirez Exhibit No. 15.)
21	BY MR. SHOOK:
22	Q I want to show you a document that has the
23	marking KALW-000146 through 000148 on it, and if you
24	could, please, describe to me what we've got here.
25	A This is a listing of City Visions programs
	Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

- that appear to have been produced in 1992 and 1993. 1 Do you have any knowledge as to who prepared 2 this document and the circumstances that surrounded 3 its preparation? 4 This looks like a document that would have 5 been produced by the City Visions producers. It looks 6 very similar to --That Exhibit O that we were talking about 8 from the petition to deny? 9 Yeah, that was. I can't explain why this 10 looks different than the other one. They appear to be 11 the same lists for the same program. 12 I think the other list, if you recall -- we 13 could find it if we needed to. That list didn't start 14 until some time in 1995, whereas this one dates back 15 to the summer of 1992. There's another thing about 16 this list that I'd like you to comment on, and that is 17 the markings that are up at the top. That could 18 perhaps help explain. 19 Yeah. This looks like it came from John 20 Covell, the producer of City Visions. This could have 21 been one of the lists that I asked him to create to 22 make sure that the public file was complete with 23
 - Is there some indication as to when this

 Heritage Reporting Corporation
 (202) 628-4888

respect to the program lists.

2**4** 25

- 1 document was prepared?
- A Yeah. At the top, there's a phone number.
- 3 There's John's name, a telephone number, and then the
- date 10/24/97 and the time, and then this would be 1
- 5 of 9, 1/9.
- 6 Q From your dealings with Mr. Covell, would
- 7 the markings that we've just talked about suggest to
- 8 you that the document was faxed to you on October 24,
- 9 1997?
- 10 A No. I mean, they suggest that it was faxed
- 11 to someone on 10/24/97. I don't have a -- I don't
- remember receiving this in October 1997.
- 13 Q So it's conceivable that it was prepared
- sometime well in advance of October 1997. You just
- don't know one way or the other.
- 16 A Yeah, that's conceivable. I can't explain
- for why it has -- why it's dated 10/24/97. I can't
- 18 explain that.
- 19 Q Do you recall that when we were talking
- about your January 1998 declaration there was a
- 21 reference in there that you had relied on Exhibit O of
- 22 the petition to deny as the basis for the
- 23 certification that you had made to the renewal
- 24 application question of whether or not the public file
- 25 had the appropriate documentation in it? You did not

1	rely on what we're looking at now, apparently?
2	A Correct, according to the declaration.
3	Q Which would suggest to me that the document
4	that we're now looking at was generated sometime after
5	the renewal application was prepared.
6	A It's conceivable. I can't explain the
7	difference between this document and the other, except
8	for the dates and the format, so it is conceivable.
9	Q But you don't have any recollection in terms
10	of when it was that the document that we're now
11	looking at KALW-000147 and 148, when it was that it
12	came into existence?
13	A Correct.
14	MR. SHOOK: I want to take about a three
15	minute break and confer with Dana.
16	(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)
17	BY MR. SHOOK:
18	Q Basically, just one question. That is, the
19	renewal application was signed off on in late July
20	1997, do you have any recollection as to approximately
21	how far in advance of that date had you received the
22	renewal application itself to start working on?
23	A The application itself, I don't recall when
24	I received the application. I do remember that when
25	we were in no, I do remember that when we were
	Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

- already in the new station, and I was --
- 2 Q In other words, it would have been after
- 3 January?
- A Correct. I remember having a postcard.
- 5 From that point forward, I don't -- the postcard
- 6 basically would signal to me that FCC license renewal,
- 7 I'd have to start some work activity. From that point
- 8 forward, I don't remember receiving the application,
- 9 or I don't remember how I got the application. I
- 10 remember the postcard, though, because that was a
- 11 moment when I though, oh.
- 12 Q Did you actually receive the application
- 13 from your lawyer?
- 14 A I don't remember.
- 15 Q You were the person that actually filled out
- 16 the application, weren't you?
- 17 A To the best of my knowledge, I would have
- 18 been the one who filled out the application.
- 19 O And you were checking the "yes" and the "no"
- 20 boxes?
- 21 A Yeah, but I don't remember typing in -- I'm
- 22 not good with typewriters. I don't remember -- it
- looks like the check marks are typed in. I don't have
- a recollection of sitting down and typing the Xs in or
- 25 the -- yeah, the Xs in.

```
1
                Do you think you filled out the application
 2
      handwritten in draft and then sent it off to somebody
 3
      to type it?
 4
           Α
                 That's a good question. I think that's what
 5
      I would have done. I would have had a paper copy and
 6
      in pencil or pen said these are the things that need
 7
      to be placed into the application, please type them
 8
      up.
                 Given how you worked, that's the most likely
 9
            O
10
      scenario that you can think of?
                 Correct.
11
                 MR. SHOOK: I have nothing further.
12
13
                 MS. LEAVITT: I just have one other question
      that follows onto what Mr. Shook asked. Although you
14
      don't recall exactly how you came into possession of
15
      the application, do you recall approximately when you
16
17
      started actually working on filling in the
      application, focusing on it?
18
                 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.
19
                 MS. LEAVITT: That's it.
20
21
                 MS. REPP: I just have a few questions and
      some documents to review, Jeff.
22
23
                 THE WITNESS: Okay.
24
      11
25
      11
```

1	EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE WITNESS
2	BY MS. REPP:
3	Q Can I ask you, and please put aside all
4	modesty, but what do you think were the attributes and
5	your goals that made you attractive to the district in
6	terms of hiring you as a general manager in 1996?
7	A I think they were looking for someone young.
8	I definitely fit that bill at the time.
9	Q Excuse me. How old were you at the time?
10	A Twenty-nine. I think that they were looking
11	for a person of color. I think that that
12	significantly is one of the reasons why Enrique
13	approached me about the position at the convention in
14	Washington back in 1996. I know that the station was
15	looking to involve students more in station
16	operations, and my background at KPBS, which was
17	located at a university, involved having students
18	university students, mind you involved in the
19	production of programs as interns or as paid student
20	assistants.
21	In fact, as a student assistant was my first
22	job at KPBS itself back in 1988. I was also involved
23	in a CPB strategic management program called The Next
24	Generation Project, which focused on providing
25	management training to minorities in public radio
	Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

specifically, and I was one of about a dozen people in 1 2 the class. I think that one of the things that Enrique 3 asked me to craft during the application interview 4 process was a vision paper for the station, and I was able to put together a quite lengthy, multipage vision of how I saw -- or my vision for taking station 7 8 forward. It included involving students, working more 9 closely with the other public radio stations in the Bay area, carving out a service niche in the Bay area 10 to heighten the service value that listeners placed in 11 the station so that we could generate even greater 12 13 listener contributions. I think I had a lot of energy back then. 14 I think that Enrique could see me in that I 15 get along well with all kinds of people, and he knew 16 that there had been a lot of animosity at the station 17 among staff, and he needed someone to go in there and 18 19 heal. I think those were the parts of the character and quality that he saw. 20 Could you just on the Next Generation 21 Project explain that a little bit more? How did that 22 23 work? Was that something you interviewed for and were 24 selected? Is it a national program? 25 Yeah, it was a national program. I was Heritage Reporting Corporation

(202) 628-4888

1 working at KPBS at the time. The station general manager, Doug Myrland, who -- he was kind of like a 2 mentor for me at the station. He saw this 3 announcement that was sent out to the system announcing this CPB program where they would provide, 5 I think it was like a \$5,000 stipend that you could 6 use to do out and do training activities. I think I 7 used my stipend to travel to other stations to see how 9 they do what they do at those stations. 10 The program was mainly meant to help people 11 at the program director and general manager level. I was the only person in the program who was a producer, 12 but I think they allowed me into the program because 13 the CPB saw enough qualities in me that, he'd make a 14 good manager, so why don't we let him into the 15 16 program. 17 Q You said there were about 12 people in your class. Was this a yearly program? 18 Supposed to be a yearly program, but halfway 19 20 through our term, the project manager at CPB left the 21 company, and there was a period of no activity, so we

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

were actually in the program for almost two years. We

So you were able to travel to other stations

graduated at the same time as the next class.

and see how they operated under the program?

22 23

24

25

1	A Correct. As a producer at the station, I
2	didn't get to do a lot of traveling or be exposed to a
3	lot of other station operations. I can remember that
4	they flew us out here to Washington, and we spent a
5	couple days in a workshop, a strategic management
6	workshop, had the opportunity to tour NPR, had the
7	opportunity to tour PBS, had the opportunity to tour
8	the old FCC when it was located
9	Q In the nice part of town?
0	A in the nice part of town. I remember
1	that again I used my stipend to visit other stations.
12	I traveled to National Public Radio to see just to
13	be exposed to their operations, because they're known
4	as a quite successful radio operation. They're the
15	ones that produce Garrison Keillor, Marketplace.
16	There's another that they're producing, I can't
.7	remember.
8	I used my funding to go visit Ohio
9	University, where they run a one year graduate degree
0	program in public broadcasting management. I went
21	there because I was curious. I thought I might go get
22	my graduate degree. It was a one year program. I
:3	still think about doing that. I never followed
4	through on that. There was also the opportunity to
5	network. The program in fact, the reason why I was

1	at the public radio conference in washington in 1999
2	was as part of the Next Generation Project, not
3	because my station sent me.
4	So if it hadn't been for the project, I
5	wouldn't have been there in Washington to meet Enrique
6	and then wind up here.
7	Q See what it did for you.
8	A An interesting chain of events.
9	(The document referred to was
10	marked for identification as
11	Ramirez Exhibit No. 16.)
12	BY MS. REPP:
13	O I just wanted to show you a document that
14	was produced by San Francisco Unified School District.
15	It has a number on it, SFUSD-00201, and it runs
16	through -00206, entitled KALW-FM Radio Financial
17	Statements for the Year Ended June 30, 1997. Could
18	you take a look at this document and tell me if you're
19	familiar with it, Jeff?
20	A Yeah, I'm familiar with this. I haven't
21	seen this ever since it says the date on it. I
22	remember working with the accountants to provide
23	information for an audit for the financial report.
24	Q So this audit by the independent auditor,
25	Bunker & Company, was prepared while you were general
	Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888